

Amendment and Response

Applicant: Kelli H. Kennedy et al.

Serial No.: 09/782,765

Filed: February 13, 2001

Docket No.: 10005680-1

Title: DOCUMENT DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM AND METHOD WITH CONSOLIDATED DOCUMENT SERVICES MANAGEMENT

REMARKS

The following Remarks are made in response to the Office Action mailed February 4, 2005, in which claims 1, 3-7, 9-17, 19, 21, 23-27, 29, and 30 were rejected. With this amendment, claim 11 has been cancelled without prejudice, and claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 19, 21, 26, and 27 have been amended to clarify Applicant's invention. Claims 1, 3-7, 9, 10, 12-17, 19, 21, 23-27, 29, and 30, therefore, remain pending in the application and are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3-7, 9-17, 19, 21, 23-27, 29, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Straub et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,216,141.

With this Amendment, independent claims 1, 9, 10, 19, 26, and 27 have been amended to clarify that the publishing services include print publishing services, and that the document is that of a document provider such that the user of the method or the system is the document provider.

With respect to the Straub et al. patent, this patent does not teach or suggest a method of distributing a document of a document provider as claimed in independent claim 1, a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing a method of distributing a document of a document provider as claimed in independent claim 9, a system for distributing a document of a document provider as claimed in independent claim 10, a method of managing document distribution services of a plurality of document distribution providers as claimed in independent claim 19, a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing a method of managing document distribution services of a plurality of document distribution providers as claimed in independent claim 26, nor a system for managing document distribution services as claimed in independent claim 27.

For example, the Straub et al. patent discloses a system and method for displaying a rich multimedia document in the same window as a desktop window wherein a client computer connects to a computer network and retrieves a channel guide or list of content providers from which a user can select one or more content providers such that the client

Amendment and Response

Applicant: Kelli H. Kennedy et al.

Serial No.: 09/782,765

Filed: February 13, 2001

Docket No.: 10005680-1

Title: DOCUMENT DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM AND METHOD WITH CONSOLIDATED DOCUMENT SERVICES MANAGEMENT

computer retrieves a document associated with a content provider selected from the channel guide and the document is integrated into the desktop window on the client computer (see Abstract). The content provider of the Straub et al. patent, therefore, is the document provider and the user of the system and method of the Straub et al. patent selects the content provider and the desired document preferences (see, e.g., col. 3, lines 18-35). The user of the Straub et al. patent, however, is not the content provider (i.e., the document provider) nor is the content provider (i.e., the document provider) presented with and select distribution options for the document. In addition, the Straub et al. patent merely displays the document in the desktop window. The Straub et al. patent, however, does not provide document distribution services including at least one of print services, electronic mail services, and print publishing services for the document.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 9, 10, 19, 26, and 27 are each patentably distinct from the Straub et al. patent and, therefore, are each in a condition for allowance. Furthermore, as dependent claims 3-7 further define patentably distinct claim 1, dependent claims 12-17 further define patentably distinct claim 10, dependent claims 21 and 23-25 further define patentably distinct claim 19, and dependent claims 29 and 30 further define patentably distinct claim 27, Applicant submits that dependent claims 3-7, 12-17, 21, 23-25, 29, and 30 are also in a condition for allowance. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1, 3-7, 9, 10, 12-17, 19, 21, 23-27, 29, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) be reconsidered and withdrawn and that claims 1, 3-7, 9, 10, 12-17, 19, 21, 23-27, 29, and 30 be allowed.

Amendment and Response

Applicant: Kelli H. Kennedy et al.

Serial No.: 09/782,765

Filed: February 13, 2001

Docket No.: 10005680-1

Title: DOCUMENT DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM AND METHOD WITH CONSOLIDATED DOCUMENT SERVICES MANAGEMENT

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 1, 3-7, 9, 10, 12-17, 19, 21, 23-27, 29, and 30 are all in a condition for allowance and requests reconsideration of the application and allowance of all pending claims.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to either Nathan R. Rieth at Telephone No. (208) 396-5287, Facsimile No. (208) 396-3958 or Scott A. Lund at Telephone No. (612) 573-2006, Facsimile No. (612) 573-2005. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,
Kelli Hodge Kennedy et al.,
By their attorneys,
DICKE, BILLIG & CZAJA, PLLC
Fifth Street Towers, Suite 2250
100 South Fifth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 573-2006
Facsimile: (612) 573-2005

Date: May 4, 2005
SAL:jan

Scott A. Lund
Reg. No. 41,166

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this paper or papers, as described herein, are being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Fax No. (703) 872-9306 on this 4th day of May, 2005.

By
Name: Scott A. Lund